



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*ch*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,357	09/20/2003	Craig A. Rosen	PS901	5455

22195 7590 11/01/2006

HUMAN GENOME SCIENCES INC.  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT.  
14200 SHADY GROVE ROAD  
ROCKVILLE, MD 20850

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, HOPE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1652

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/664,357

Applicant(s)

ROSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Hope A. Robinson

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13, 16, 20, 21 and 24-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20, 21 and 30-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13, 16 and 25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/24/06
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1652

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Application Status***

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1652.
2. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II (claims 11-13 and 17) on August 24, 2006 is acknowledged. Applicant's comments regarding a rejoinder of method claims upon notification of an allowable product is noted.

### ***Claim Disposition***

3. Claims 25-32 have been added. Claims 1-10 have been cancelled. Claims 11-13, 16, 20-21 and 24-32 are pending. Claims 11-13, 16 and 25-29 are under examination. Claims 20-21 and 30-32 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.12(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant is reminded that the proper claim identifiers are: currently amended, withdrawn and amended, cancelled and previously presented. Note that claims such as claims 20 and 21 have improper claim identifiers as these claims are withdrawn.

### ***Specification***

Art Unit: 1652

4. The specification is objected to because of the following informalities:
- (a) The specification is objected to because trademarks are disclosed throughout the instant specification and not all of them are capitalized or accompanied by the generic terminology. The use of the trademarks such as TAQMAN® for example, have been noted in this application (see page 31). It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks. Applicant is urged to check the large specification thoroughly for other trademarks that are improper.
- (b) The specification is also objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. See for example page 33. It is suggested that http:// is deleted.
- Correction is required.

### ***Sequence Compliance***

5. It is noted that applicant filed a sequence listing in paper and computer readable form (CRF), however, the statement that affirms that the content of the sequence listing information in the CRF is identical to the paper copy of the sequence listing, and, where applicable, includes no new matter does not indicate that "there is no new matter". Therefore, the instant application fails to fully comply with the sequence rules. A signed

Art Unit: 1652

statement regarding no new matter is required. It is noted that applicant amended Table 1A, applicant is urged to file a new paper copy and CRF if the cases made directly affects the previous sequence submission.

***Claim Rejections-Utility Rejections Under 35 USC § 101 And 35 USC 112, First Paragraph***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 11-13, 16 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks a credible, substantial, specific, or well-established utility.

Claims 11-13, 16 and 25-29 are directed to a polypeptide comprised in SEQ ID NO: 408. The claimed polypeptides are not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility. The specification fails to provide objective evidence of any activity for the claimed proteins. A well-established utility is a specific, substantial, and credible utility that is well known, immediately apparent or implied by

Art Unit: 1652

the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material. There is no specific disease or specific function that is suggested for the claimed polypeptides. It is noted that the specification indicates that the invention relates to human secreted proteins/polypeptides, and isolated nucleic acid molecules encoding said proteins/polypeptides, useful for detecting, preventing, diagnosing, prognosticating, treating and/or ameliorating cardiovascular diseases, disorders and or conditions related thereto, however, no specific association is made or demonstrated. It is further stated that the proteins of the claimed invention can be used to detect cancers and may be involved in the diseases associated with the biological activity, i.e. cellular signaling. In addition, it is disclosed in the specification that diseases such as immune disorders, autoimmune diseases and infectious diseases can be treated with the claimed product, however, no specific association is made or demonstrated. No real association is made between a specific disorder/disease and the claimed products.

The specification does not disclose any particular conditions wherein there is a deficiency or overproduction of the claimed polypeptide. What disorder/disease results from a decreased expression or activity of the polypeptide, the specification does not disclose specific information. No evidence is provided, for example, that the polypeptide is not expressed in healthy tissues. It could be a constitutively expressed gene, and thus would not be useful in developing drugs for any disease. Even if it were differentially expressed in cancerous tissues, for example, there is no indication regarding how to develop a drug to treat specific cancers, because there is no information disclosed regarding the role the polypeptide plays in healthy tissue. For

Art Unit: 1652

example, the instant specification state that allergic and or asthmatic diseases and disorders can be treated with the claimed protein, however, no evidence is provided of the reduction in any of the disclosed diseases or disorders or the treatment of the same nor is there any evidence of said protein in association with any specific disease/disorder. Thus, no empirical evidence exists on the record to demonstrate the association as claimed between the claimed protein and cancers, immune diseases/disorders, asthmatic diseases or any other diseases. The specification contains several Tables, which do not provide any evidence to demonstrate nor describe the claimed invention.

The specification asserts that the products of the invention can be used (1) as drugs for the treatment or prevention of cancers, infectious diseases and the like (2) in diagnosing disease and (3) as probes. As for drugs for the treatment or prevention of cancers, this asserted utility is not substantial. The specification does not disclose any particular conditions wherein there is a deficiency, overproduction, or altered form of the claimed polypeptides. The fact that the polynucleotide encoding the claim protein can be found in libraries of cells isolated from for example, cancerous tissues or immune system cells would not indicate to one of skill in the art that the protein is involved with any of the above conditions. Even if it were differentially expressed in disease tissues, for example, there is no indication regarding how to develop a drug to treat any specific disease based on the protein, because there is no information disclosed regarding the role the protein plays in healthy tissue. Significant further experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to identify individuals who would benefit from such a drug,

Art Unit: 1652

and then to determine a best course of treatment. There is no disclosure, for example, of how to assay for improvement or intolerable levels of side effects or dosages of the drug. Since this asserted utility is not presented in mature form, so that it could be readily used in a real world sense, the asserted utility is not substantial.

It is asserted that the invention can be used in diagnosing disease with the protein, this assertion is not substantial. The specification does not disclose any specific diseases associated with altered levels or forms of the protein as discussed above. Significant further experimentation would be required of one skilled in the art to identify individuals having such a disease. There is no indicia, for example, of any symptoms associated with such a disease/disorder. As this asserted utility is not presented in mature form, so that it could be readily used in a real world sense, the asserted utility is not substantial. The assertion is made of a use as probes; however, this utility is not specific, as this can be done with any polynucleotide. Expressed polynucleotides have a variety of general uses, for example, as a probe for hybridization or as a template for protein expression, these uses are applicable to any expressed polynucleotide and are not specific to the claimed polynucleotide MPEP 2107.01 states that, "Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm 'real world' context of use are not substantial utilities".

In view of the foregoing, and absent data/evidence, the claimed invention lack utility. See *Brenner v. Manson*, 383, U.S. 519, 535-36, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (1966), noting that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is a reward for the search, but



Art Unit: 1652

compensation for its successful conclusion". A patent is therefore not a license to experiment. See also the Utility Guidelines available at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov).

7. Claims 11-12 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 11-12 and 25-28 are drawn to a protein, which reads on a product of nature. The claims should be amended to indicate the hand of the inventor, for example the insertion of "isolated" or "purified" in connection with the protein to identify a product not found in nature (see MPEP 2105).

8. Claims 11-13, 16 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention so that it would operate as intended without undue experimentation.

In addition the amount of experimentation required to practice the claimed invention is undue as the claims encompass an unspecified amount of fragments that are not supported by the instant specification. The claimed polypeptide once modified might not have the same properties of the native/wild-type protein or retain the same function. The claims recite language such as "at least 30 amino acids...wherein said fragment has biological activity", however, no specific activity is disclosed. Note also that the 30 amino acid residues does not have to be contiguous and the claims do not indicate where variations will occur or what variations can be tolerated in the sequence.

The instant specification does not demonstrate or provide guidance as to what the structure of the protein will be once modified or if said protein will be functional or exhibit the same properties or characteristics as the native protein. In the instant application, the partial structure in the form of the recited percent identity is insufficient to determine a chemical structure for the variants encompassed in the claims.

Additionally, there is no data provided demonstrative of a particular portion of the structure that must be conserved. Note that the claims do not have a functional limitation *per se*, thus, modifications to the polypeptide sequence, may result in a protein that is at best has a different function or at worst has no activity. Due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to generate the infinite number of variants/fragments recited in the claims and possibly screen same for activity and the lack of guidance/direction provided in the instant specification, this is merely an invitation to the skilled artisan to use the current invention as a starting point for further experimentation.

Predictability of which potential changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (for example, expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the protein's structure relates to its function. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, for example, multiple substitutions. In this case, the necessary guidance has not been

Art Unit: 1652

provided in the specification. Therefore, while it is known in the art that many amino acid substitutions are possible in any given protein, the positions within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with a reasonable expectation of success are limited, as certain positions in the sequence are critical to the protein's structure/function relationship. It is also known in the art that a single nucleotide or amino acid change or mutation can destroy the function of the biomolecule in many cases. For example, various sites or regions directly involved in binding activity and in providing the correct three-dimensional spatial orientation of binding and active sites can be affected (see Wells, *Biochemistry*, vol. 29, pages 8509-8517, 1990). The instant specification provides no guidance/direction as to which regions of the protein would be tolerant of modifications and which would not, and it provides no working examples of any variant sequence that is encompassed by the claims. It is in no way predictable that randomly selected mutations, such as deletions, substitutions, additions, etc., in the disclosed sequences would result in a protein having activity comparable to the one disclosed. As plural substitutions for example are introduced, their interactions with each other and their effects on the structure and function of the protein is unpredictable. The skilled artisan would recognize the high degree of unpredictability that all the fragments/variants encompassed in the claims would retain function. This make and test position is inconsistent with the decisions of *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) where it is stated that "...scope of claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art...". Without sufficient guidance,

Art Unit: 1652

determination of having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily and improperly extensive and undue. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

9. Claims 11-13, 16 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to a polypeptide comprised in SEQ ID NO:408 (see claim 11). The claimed invention is encompass a genus of fragments of the protein in (SEQ ID NO:408), however, no function is associated with the protein *per se*. Absent functional language, the skilled artisan would not know if said fragments had the same function as the wild-type or a different function. The specification lacks adequate written description to demonstrate to a skilled artisan that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention.

In addition, the claimed invention lacks complete deposit information. The specification makes reference to deposits made to ATCC (see page 1647 for example, Table 6) and the claims are directed to ATCC Deposit No. 203071, however, this is insufficient assurance that all of the conditions of 37 CFR 1.801-1.809 have been met, because the specification does not indicate whether the sequence of the invention contained in ATCC Deposit No. 203071 is known and publicly available or can be reproducibly isolated. Without publicly available deposit information one skilled in the

Art Unit: 1652

art could not be assured of the ability to practice the invention as claimed. It is noted that applicant made the deposits under the Budapest Treaty, however, the specification need to be amended to disclose the date of the deposit and the public availability of the deposit. For further information concerning deposit practice, applicants attention is directed to In re Lundark 773 F 2d 1216 227 USPQ CCAFC and 37 CFR 1.801-1.809.

Moreover, the claims are directed to nucleotide sequences that comprise sequential deletions from the C or N terminus and there is no limit on the amount of nucleotides that can be deleted, and no demonstration of any conserved region or the effects of the modifications contemplated.

Thus, in view of the foregoing the claimed invention lacks proper written description and the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of all the claimed fragments encompassed by the claims. Additionally, the instant specification has not provided a representative number of species for the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species, which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, disclosure of drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, for example, structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus.

Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus. The claimed genus of polypeptides could include non-functional proteins or proteins with a different function than the one described. Therefore, the genus of claimed polypeptides encompasses widely variant species. Based on the unlimited variations contemplated one skilled in the art would at best expect a protein that is different or at worst a protein that is not functional.

*Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir.1991), states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in *possession of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*" (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed" (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of polypeptides, and therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993).

Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 13 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter, which applicant (s) regard as their invention.

Claims 13 and 29 lack clear antecedent basis for the recitation of "isolated polypeptide" as the independent claims recite "polypeptide".

Claim 13 is indefinite for the recitation of "comprises sequential nucleotide deletions" as the entire C or N terminus could be deleted as there is no upper limit.

### ***Conclusion***

11. No claims are allowable.

Art Unit: 1652

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy, can be reached at (571) 272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hope Robinson, MS

Primary Examiner

HOPE ROBINSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*Handwritten:* 10/28/06